

Remarks

In the present response, claim 22 is canceled. Claims 1-21 and 23 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over US publication number 2004/0243692 (Arnold) in view of US publication number 2003/0167245 (Murata). Applicants respectfully assert that the current rejections are **moot** in view of the amended claims.

The rejected claims recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Arnold in view of Murata. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As a precursor to the arguments, Applicants provide an overview of Arnold and Murata. This overview will assist in determining the scope and content of the prior art as required in Graham (see *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 setting out an objective analysis for applying 103 rejections).

As discussed in Arnold, storage allocation is a process that involves configuring and initializing data storage devices and mapping parts of the storage areas on those storage devices (see Arnold at paragraph [0002]). Many devices (such as physical storage media, storage area networks, switches, adapters, etc.) need to be adjusted during the storage allocation process. Arnold teaches methods to automate the steps involved in storage allocation (see Arnold summary of the invention).

Murata relates to technologies that evaluate a summary of an article or document with a computer. The computer automatically performs summaries of articles using supervised machine learning methods.

Arnold and Murata Not Teach/Suggest All Claim Elements

The independent claims recite elements that are not taught or suggested in Arnold in view of Murata. Some examples are provided below for the independent claims.

As one example, claim 1 recites “determining patterns that characterize the parameterizations and the system configuration attributes that are common among a set of the managed computers that are comparable.” As another example, claim 14 recites “a supervised machine learning algorithm that determines patterns in the parameterizations, the patterns characterizing the parameterizations and the configuration attributes that are common among a set of the managed computers that are comparable.” As another example, claim 23 recites “determining patterns that characterize the parameterizations and the system configuration attributes that are common among a set of the managed computers.”

Arnold does not even mention determining patterns for parameterizations or constraints as recited in claims 1, 14, and 23. Arnold is silent as to determining patterns. The Office Action cites paragraph [0023] in Arnold. This paragraph discusses a management unit that obtains configuration information and usage metrics to execute commands and functions that it deems appropriate. Paragraph [0023] does not mention or even suggest determining patterns for parameterizations or constraints. **Arnold does not even discuss the use of patterns.** Murata fails to cure these deficiencies.

As another example, claim 1 recites “identifying, based on the comparing, at least one exceptionally managed computer that has a parameterization that deviates from the parameterizations of the set of the managed computers that are comparable.” As another example, claim 14 recites “an isolating component that isolates exceptionally managed computers that deviate from the patterns that characterize the set of the managed computers that are comparable.” As another example, claim 23 recites “identifying, based on the comparing, an exceptionally managed computer that has a parameterization that deviates from the parameterizations of the set of the managed computers.”

The combination of Arnold and Murata does not identify exceptionally managed “computers” as recited in claims 1, 14, and 23. Further, this combination does not identify a computer that has parameterizations that deviate as recited in the claims.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Arnold in view of Murata.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 6-7 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over US publication number 2004/0243692 (Arnold) in view of US publication number 2003/0167245 (Murata) and US publication number 2003/0028825 (Hines). These rejections are traversed.

As explained above, Arnold and Murata fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the independent claims. Hines fails to cure these deficiencies. Thus for at least these reasons, claims 6-7 and 17-18 are allowable over Arnold in view of Murata and Hines.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529